

Cyclic Approximation to K-Stasis

Stewart D. Johnson

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Williams College

March 30, 2008

Abstract

If a linear combination of k smooth vector fields is zero at a point, then, generically, near this point there are small cycles comprised of segments from the flow of each vector field. This answers a question posed in arXiv:math/0504365.

KEYWORDS: STASIS POINTS, SWITCHING SYSTEMS, DIFFERENTIAL INCLUSION, RELAXED CONTROLS

1 Definitions and Results

Vector fields

$$\mathbf{V}_j : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, k$$

induce flows

$$\mathbf{F}_j(\mathbf{x}, t) : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n.$$

A point $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a **K-stasis point** if

$$\sum_{j=1}^k m_j \mathbf{V}_j(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{0}$$

for some probability weighting $(m_1, \dots, m_k)$; where each $m_j > 0$ and $\sum m_j = 1$.

The stasis point is **regular** if

$$\sum_{j=1}^k m_j \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}_j}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}_0)$$

is non-singular.

A **K-cycle** is a sequence of points $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and a sequence of times $(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_k)$ with each $\delta_j > 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \delta_1) &= \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \mathbf{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_2, \delta_2) &= \mathbf{x}_3 \\ &\vdots \\ \mathbf{F}_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \delta_k) &= \mathbf{x}_1. \end{aligned}$$

We have the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *If $\mathbf{x}_0$ is a regular K-stasis point with weighting $(m_1, \dots, m_k)$ then for all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ there exists a K-cycle with the time vector $(\delta m_1, \dots, \delta m_k)$.*

Proof:

Without loss of generality take $\mathbf{x}_0 = 0$. Define

$$\mathcal{F} : \underbrace{\mathbb{R}^n \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^n}_k \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$$

as an average velocity

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k, \delta) = \frac{(\mathbf{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \delta m_1) - \mathbf{x}_1) + \cdots + (\mathbf{F}_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \delta m_k) - \mathbf{x}_k)}{\delta}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{F}$ is C^1 near $(\mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0}, 0)$, and that for $\delta = 0$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}_j} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k, 0) = m_j \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}_j}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}_j)$$

Now

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k, \delta) \\ \mathbf{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \delta m_1) - \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \mathbf{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_2, \delta m_2) - \mathbf{x}_3 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{F}_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \delta m_{k-1}) - \mathbf{x}_k \end{pmatrix} : \underbrace{\mathbb{R}^n \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^n}_k \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \underbrace{\mathbb{R}^n \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^n}_k$$

with

$$\left. \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k, \delta) \\ \mathbf{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \delta m_1) - \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{F}_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \delta m_{k-1}) - \mathbf{x}_k \end{pmatrix} \right|_{(\mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0}, 0)} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}$$

By the implicit function theorem,

$$\left. \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k, \delta) \\ \mathbf{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \delta m_1) - \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{F}_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \delta m_{k-1}) - \mathbf{x}_k \end{pmatrix} \right|_{(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k, \delta)} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}$$

will have solutions

$$\mathbf{x}_1(\delta), \dots, \mathbf{x}_k(\delta)$$

for small non-zero δ provided that the $nk \times nk$ matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k, \delta)}{\partial \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k} \\ \frac{\partial (\mathbf{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \delta m_1) - \mathbf{x}_2)}{\partial \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial (\mathbf{F}_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \delta m_{k-1}) - \mathbf{x}_k)}{\partial \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k} \end{bmatrix}_{(\mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0}, 0)}$$

is non-singular.

This evaluates to

$$\begin{bmatrix} m_1 \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}_1}{\partial \mathbf{x}} & m_2 \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}_2}{\partial \mathbf{x}} & m_3 \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}_3}{\partial \mathbf{x}} & \cdots & m_k \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}_k}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \\ \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{I} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & -\mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}_{(\mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0}, 0)}$$

This matrix is singular iff $\sum_{j=1}^k m_j \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}_j}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{0})$ is singular, and the result follows. ■